

June 29, 2015



Talbot County Planning Commission
Final Decision Summary

Wednesday, May 6, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.
Talbot County Library, Conference Room
100 W Dover Street, Easton, Maryland

Attendance:

Commission Members:

Thomas Hughes, Chairman
John N. Fischer, Jr., Vice Chairman
William Boicourt
Michael Sullivan - Absent
Paul Spies

Staff:

Mary Kay Verdery, Planning Officer
Daniel Brandewie, Assistant Planning Officer
Jeremy Rothwell, Planner I
Martin Sokolich, Long Range Planner
Tony Kupersmith, Assistant County Attorney
Carole Sellman, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order—Commissioner Hughes called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioner Hughes explained that Commissioner Sullivan would not be in attendance. He explained that tie votes are considered a negative vote. If any applicant chooses they can withdraw without penalty until the next month. All applicants chose to move forward

2. Decision Summary Review—April 1, 2015—The Commission noted the following corrections to the draft decision summary:

- a. Line 176, delete word worried, insert: "Commissioner Fisher stated that he was less concerned about a precedent being set."
- b. Line 208, correct to read "Commissioner Hughes opposed."
- c. Line 387, correct to read: "Akridge".

Commissioner Spies moved to approve the draft Planning Commission Decision Summary for April 1, 2015, as amended; Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Old Business—None.

4. New Business

- a. Administrative Variance—Roger Sola-Solé and Stephanie Sola-Solé, #A214—26344 Arcadia Shores Circle, Easton, MD 21601, (map 33, grid 14, parcel 118, zoned Rural Residential)

Mr. Rothwell presented the staff report of the applicant's request for the construction of a 269 square foot pervious deck within the Shoreline Development Buffer. Applicant is also seeking construction of a separate 50

55 square foot pervious deck within the Shoreline Development Buffer. No trees will
56 be removed or affected.

57
58 Staff recommendations include:

- 59
60 1. The applicant shall make an application to the Office of Permits and
61 Inspections, and follow all rules, procedures, and construction timelines as
62 outlined regarding new construction.
63 2. The applicant shall commence construction on the proposed improvements
64 within eighteen (18) months from the date of the Planning Office's "Notice to
65 Proceed".
66 3. Natural vegetation of an area three times the extent of the approved
67 disturbance in the buffer shall be planted in the buffer or on the property if
68 planting in the Buffer cannot be reasonably accomplished. Disturbance
69 outside the buffer shall be 1:1 ratio. A Buffer Management Plan application
70 may be obtained through the Department of Planning and Zoning.
71 4. As part of the requirements associated with the installation of pervious decks,
72 the applicant shall be required to install approved native plants around the
73 perimeter of the two proposed pervious decks. A listing of approved native
74 plants can be obtained from Elisa Deflaux at the Department of Planning and
75 Zoning at 410-770-8030.
76

77 Ms. Stephanie Sola-Sole, owner and architect appeared before the Commission.
78

79 Mr. Rothwell stated that for the deck to count as a pervious deck the owner will
80 be required to plant native plants around the deck.
81

82 Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments, none were made.
83

84 Commissioner Boicourt moved to recommend to the Planning Officer to approve
85 the Administrative Variance for Roger and Stephanie Sola-Solé, 26344 Arcadia
86 Shores Circle, Easton, MD 21601, for construction of two pervious decks,
87 provided compliance with staff recommendations occurs, Commissioner Fischer
88 seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
89

- 90 b. Administrative Variance—Eric Mann and Marianne Mann, #A215—9793 Pintail
91 Place, St. Michaels, MD 21663, (map 23, grid 1, parcel 83, lot 12, zoned Rural
92 Residential), Lars Erickson, East Bay Construction, Agent.
93

94 Mr. Rothwell presented the staff report of the applicant's request for:
95

- 96 1. The construction of a 6' x 35'4" (212 sq.ft.) mudroom and laundry on the
97 southwest face of the existing primary dwelling. The proposed addition will
98 increase the gross floor area (GFA) of the existing dwelling within the
99 Shoreline Development Buffer by approximately 5.67%.

- 100 2. The construction of a 6'3" x 18'6" covered porch on the southwest face of the
101 existing primary dwelling. Only a small portion of this development activity is
102 within the Shoreline Development Buffer.
103 3. The construction of an A-gable roof on the southwest portion of an existing
104 hexagonal roof. The vertical expansion associated with this proposed gabled
105 roof will not increase the gross floor area (GFA) of the existing primary
106 dwelling, and only a portion of this development activity is within the
107 Shoreline Development Buffer.
108

109 Staff recommendations include:
110

- 111 1. The applicant shall make an application to the Office of Permits and
112 Inspections, and follow all rules, procedures, and construction timelines as
113 outlined regarding new construction.
114 2. The applicant shall commence construction on the proposed improvements
115 within eighteen (18) months from the date of the Planning Office's "Notice to
116 Proceed".
117 3. Natural vegetation of an area three times the extent of the approved
118 disturbance in the buffer shall be planted in the buffer or on the property if
119 planting in the Buffer cannot be reasonably accomplished. Disturbance
120 outside the buffer shall be 1:1 ratio. A Buffer Management Plan application
121 may be obtained through the Department of Planning and Zoning.
122

123 Commissioner Hughes asked what the zoning of the property is today. Mr.
124 Rothwell stated it is zoned Rural Residential (RR) as compared to W2 which was
125 how it was originally zoned.
126

127 Mr. Mann, property owner and Lars Erickson appeared before the Commission.
128 Mr. Erickson stated there was a net reduction in square footage and most changes
129 are on the non-waterfront side.
130

131 Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.
132

133 Commissioner Boicourt moved to recommend to the Planning Officer to approve
134 the Administrative Variance for Eric and Marianne Mann, 9793 Pintail Place, St.
135 Michaels, MD 21663, provided compliance with staff recommendations occurs,
136 Commissioner Fischer seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
137

- 138 c. Administrative Variance—Marclyn S. Hendon, #A216—24700 Rays Point Road,
139 St. Michaels, MD 21663, (map 32, grid 8, parcel 98, zoned Rural Residential),
140 Jeff Heinsohn, Building Contractor, Agent.
141

142 Mr. Rothwell presented the staff report of the applicant's request to enclose an
143 existing covered porch within the 100 foot Shoreline Development Buffer. This
144 development activity will increase the gross floor area (GFA) of the existing

dwelling within the Shoreline Development Buffer by approximately 4.98% (50 sq.ft.).

Staff recommendations include:

1. The applicant shall make an application to the Office of Permits and Inspections, and follow all rules, procedures, and construction timelines as outlined regarding new construction.
2. The applicant shall commence construction on the proposed improvements within eighteen (18) months from the date of the Planning Office's "Notice to Proceed".
3. Natural vegetation of an area three times the extent of the approved disturbance in the buffer shall be planted in the buffer or on the property if planting in the Buffer cannot be reasonably accomplished. Disturbance outside the buffer shall be 1:1 ratio. A Buffer Management Plan application may be obtained through the Department of Planning and Zoning.

Marclyn Hendon, owner, appeared before the Commission. She stated that all she wanted to do was enclose the back porch. It was on the north side and she gets cold air. She needs the walls to keep out the cold air. Mr. Heinsohn, contractor, appeared on behalf of Ms. Hendon. He stated this end of the house gets cold quickly and enclosing the back porch would be a benefit.

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

Commissioner Spies moved to recommend to the Planning Officer to approve the Administrative Variance for Marclyn A. Hendon, 24700 Rays Point Road, St. Michaels, MD 21663, provided the applicants comply with staff recommendations, Commissioner Fischer seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- d. Blaine T. Phillips #M1154—Kintore Drive, Easton, MD 21601 (map 16, grid 23, parcel 246, Lot 9, zoned Rural Conservation/Western Rural Conservation), Sean Callahan, Lane Engineering, LLC, Agent.

Jeremy Rothwell presented the applicant's request for a lot size waiver for the proposed Lot 9A. The proposed lot at 6.426 acres, is required to obtain a lot size waiver from the Planning Commission in accordance with the *Talbot County Code* §190-14G(1)(b).

Staff recommendations include:

1. Address the July 9, 2014 Technical Advisory Committee comments from the Department of Planning and Zoning, Department of Public Works, Environmental Health Department, Talbot Soil Conservation District and the Environmental Planner prior to final plat submittal.

Mr. Bruce Armistead appeared on behalf of Mr. Phillips. He noted that the siting of this lot is adjacent to an existing lot and an existing structure, thereby preserving the bulk of this almost 70 acre parcel and open space.

Commissioner Hughes stated this appears to be a text book example of why we have a lot size waiver provision in the Code. This request is not based on a particular desire by the landowner to do something for their own amusement or benefit. It is solely based on the unique character of this individual lot noting the pipe stem, the 200 foot buffer and the other individual features making the 5 acres virtually impossible. I hope we all remember this case when we have lot size waiver requests.

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

Commissioner Spies moved to approve the Lot Size Waiver, the proposed Lot 9A at 6.426 acres is acceptable even though it is greater than 5 acres, for Blaine T. Phillips, 10410 Kintore Drive, Easton, Maryland 21601, provided compliance with staff recommendations, Commissioner Fischer seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Armistead commended the staff for the Staff Reports he has been seeing. In the past the reports have been somewhat neutral. It is very helpful for the staff reports to make a recommendation. Commission Hughes stated he hoped Mr. Armistead would relay that to the County Council because the Commission felt the staff was doing a good job as well. Commissioner Hughes stated it is more often than not that the County staff gets negative feedback when all they are doing is their jobs.

- e. Nagel Farm Service II, LLC c/o David B. Nagel #L1225—14209 Old Wye Mills Road, Wye Mills, MD 21679 (map 1, grid 10, parcel 7 & 10, zoned Village Center/Agricultural Conservation), Chris Waters, Waters Professional Land Surveyors, Agent.

Commissioner Spies recused himself. Since the Commission is now down to three members Commissioner Hughes informed the applicant he would need an affirmative vote by all three members to be approved. If the applicant chooses, he can come back without penalty. The applicant chose to proceed.

Jeremy Rothwell presented the applicant's request to revise the lot lines between Parcels 7 and 11 so as to allow the applicant to construct additional grain storage and drying facilities. Parcel 7 would increase in size from 4.32 acres to 13.79 acres, while Parcel 11 would correspondingly decrease in size from 303.24 acres to 293.77 acres.

Staff recommendations include:

- 237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
1. Address the April 8, 2015 Technical Advisory Committee comments from the Department of Planning and Zoning, Department of Public Works, Environmental Health Department, Talbot Soil Conservation District, and the Environmental Planner prior to preliminary plat submittal.
 2. The expansion of the grain processing, storage, and drying use from Parcel 7 to newly acquired lands from Parcel 11 shall obtain and comply with final site plan approval.

246
247
248

Chris Waters appeared on behalf of applicant. Mr. Waters stated he would like to request preliminary/final approval.

249
250
251
252
253
254
255

Commissioner Hughes asked why the Health Department was involved with the gravel driveway. It was explained it was close to the septic system. Mr. Waters stated there will be some metal posts to protect the tank. They will also try to take the majority of gravel from that area. Commissioner Fischer asked if the forested buffer is still there. Mr. Waters stated it is still on the Site Plan, it did not need to be on the line revision.

256
257

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

258
259
260
261
262

Commissioner Boicourt moved to give preliminary/final approval to Nagel Farm Service II, LLC, Wye Mills Road, Wye Mills, MD 21679, provided compliance with staff recommendations occurs, Commissioner Fischer seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- 263
264
265
266
- f. Talbot County, Maryland c/o William Wolinski #SP 555—Oxford Road, Oxford, MD 21654 (map 53, grid 2, parcel 90, zoned Rural Conservation/Town Conservation), Chris Waters, Agent.

267
268
269
270
271
272
273

Jeremy Rothwell presented the applicant's request for a street tree waiver; there is an existing row of bald cypress along a portion of the frontage. The code also requires screening on all parking lots within the gateway zone. Since the site plan was originally reviewed by the Commission the applicants have provided a vegetative screen for the parking area. The applicant has also installed the bike racks.

274
275
276
277

There was a misunderstanding between the Parks and Recreation Department and the preparers of the site plan, but under the rules of Talbot County there will not be a gate. There will be signs showing hours of operation.

278
279
280
281
282

The applicant is requesting a waiver because it would better preserve the scenic beauty and is a better gateway into Oxford. Mr. Rothwell stated a lot of the site plan requirements are for commercial or industrial project which are being screened from view.

283 Bill Wolinski, Environmental Engineer, Department of Public Works and Chris
284 Waters, Waters Land Surveying appeared before the Commissioner.

285
286 Commissioner Hughes asked if there will be rolling changes and if the staff can
287 approve the changes.

288
289 Mr. Rothwell said there may be some changes for which the staff can make
290 approval, but there may be some items, like this waiver, the Commission will
291 need to address.

292
293 Commissioner Hughes commented that just because this was a park and the
294 County is the owner they were not making some special consideration, this is all
295 according to regulations.

296
297 Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

298
299 Commissioner Spies moved to approve the Street Tree Waiver for Talbot County
300 Government, with the understanding that if the Site Plan or use of the property
301 changes from the current use the applicant will need to come back before the
302 Commission; and compliance with staff recommendations occurs. Commissioner
303 Boicourt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

304
305 g. 2014 Annual Report on County Growth

306
307 Martin Sokolich presented the 2014 Annual Report on County Growth. The
308 Maryland Department of Planning came up with a standard form which requests
309 that seven points be addressed.

310
311 Commissioner Hughes asked how many subdivisions were applied for and how
312 many were turned down.

313
314 Martin stated that with the source he goes to it would be hard to try to pull that
315 information out. A subdivision can take 2-3 years to complete. Some expire, some
316 are withdrawn by an applicant, some are turned down.

317
318 Commissioner Hughes stated there is a perception by some in the public that there
319 is a vast silent conspiracy to thwart growth in the County when the fact of the
320 matter is there is simply little demand in the County. We have a large supply of
321 more than a thousand unimproved lots in the County that someone could buy and
322 build a house on if someone were so disposed. There were only eleven permits
323 issued. That has nothing to do with the County, there is just little demand.

324
325 The largest subdivision, Rehobeth Farm, was initiated when the critical area law
326 changed from 100 feet to 200 feet, and there was a rush of people who were
327 speculatively subdividing their property to preserve their development rights.
328

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

Commissioner Boicourt moved to recommend to the County Council to approve the 2014 Annual Report on County Growth to Maryland Department of Planning; Commissioner Spies seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

- h. Resolution to amend the Talbot County Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan to add a new capital project for the installation of a screw press to upgrade the Region II (St. Michaels) Waste Treatment Plant (Resolution No. 219)

Ray Clarke, Talbot County Department of Public Works, presented Resolution 219, introduced by the County Council. It is associated with a requirement by the Maryland Department of the Environment. The Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan has to be amended to include this project. The current belt press has not failed but they plan to install the new screw press in an adjoining building so there is a redundancy.

The cost is roughly \$600,000. They will be applying for loan funding, but if there is a grant available they will apply for it. Commissioner Spies asked if the screw press was more efficient. Mr. Clarke stated the screw press was slightly more efficient. There are lower electric costs as well as lower maintenance costs.

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

Commissioner Spies moved to recommend to the County Council to approve Resolution No. 219, a Resolution to amend the Talbot County Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan to add a new capital project for the installation of a screw press to upgrade the Region II (St. Michaels) Wastewater Treatment Plant; it is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Boicourt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- i. Resolution to amend the Talbot County Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan to add a new capital project to upgrade the Region V (Tilghman) Wastewater Treatment Plan with enhanced nutrient removal technology (Resolution No. 220)

Mr. Clarke presented Resolution No. 220 to upgrade the Tilghman Island Wastewater Treatment Plant. To upgrade the plant the County will use a roughly 40% grant, the remaining in loan. Maryland Department of the Environment has listed this as a priority. With this the Plant should see a significant reduction in our total loads. Because we discharge out to the Bay we are required to have a shellfish protection pond with a minimum of one day storage. Commissioner Spies asked if the estimated cost of \$3.5 Million is pre- or post-grant. Mr. Clarke stated it is pre-grant. Approximately \$1.5 Million will be in grant funds and the remainder in loan funds. We have also been discussing with Rural Development extending sewer to Bar Neck and Fairbank. There has also been discussion of some strategies to extend sewer service out to Sherwood.

Commissioner Hughes asked if the capacity would stay the same? Mr. Clarke said yes it would. At the current design capacity they qualify for grant funding. If they go over, they lose their qualification for grant funding. Commissioner Hughes asked if the current capacity is capable of picking up Bar Neck and Fairbank and still cover the existing lots of record entitled to be picked up? Mr. Clarke stated that yes it is.

Commissioner Hughes asked if there are any plans to fix the inflow and infiltration problems? Mr. Clarke stated that the problem is the man holes and clean out. He said they try to pump down during the week. Commissioner Hughes stated it seems to be no need to increase the capacity of the plant, the need is to fix the infrastructure. Commissioner Hughes asked if there is a smoke test in Tilghman's future. Mr. Clarke said it is not planned in Tilghman.

Commissioner Hughes asked for public comments; none were made.

Commissioner Fischer moved to recommend to the County Council to approve Resolution No. 220, a Resolution to amend the Talbot County Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plant to add a new capital project to upgrade the Region V (Tilghman) Wastewater Treatment Plant with enhanced nutrient removal technology, it is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan; Commissioner Boicourt seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussions Items

Commissioner Fischer expressed disappointment that members of the Planning Commission have not been included in County Council public workshops on the draft Comprehensive Plan. He stated that, as drafters of the Plan, Planning Commission members might have clarified many of the questions and uncertainties expressed by Council members in the course of the workshops.

Commissioner Fisher asked Mr. Tony Kupersmith, Assistant County Attorney about the changes proposed by the County Council. There is no consensus of their changes. Multiple individuals have proposed changes. What is the process going to be and how are those changes going to be made. When are those changes going to be made and in front of whom?

Ms. Verdery stated they are being asked to make a list (make a matrix) of those changes. And in a public hearing as a group the Council will go through those items line by line. There are at least two more worksessions. Then there will be public hearings. Ms. Verdery stated she was not sure if there was going to be a document with the changes listed or a full copy of the Comprehensive Plan with the changes incorporated for the public hearings.

Commissioner Fischer stated there should be a full document with time of at least 2-3 weeks for everyone to review. The Council owes a process to the people of this County that is clear and they have a right to review this report. It is not the Council's plan, it is the citizens' plan.

Commissioner Hughes stated he is personally as irritated as Commissioner Fischer. He has been to all the worksessions and it has been painful to sit there. The problem he has been witnessing is that there is a Council that has no knowledge of or appreciation for what went into the 2005 Plan or the document produced in February; and make snap judgment changes to policies adopted over a three and a half year process with little or no deliberation or understanding of what they are doing. The most egregious is the one they started out with. There has been a prohibition in this County against strip commercial development along our roads or highways since the 1950s. That was one of the major purposes of the zoning ordinances in the 1950s. They have changed the word "prohibit" to "discourage". If that change goes through, the word discourage will be debated ad nauseam in front of this Commission. I cannot imagine the Council making changes to educational policy without having discussions with the school board, or making changes to emergency management budget without having consultation with that group, or making changes to the waste water plans without having consultations with Mr. Clarke. But somehow they feel that they are qualified to make material changes to the Comprehensive Plan, not only the one that we proposed, but the 2005 Plan which had so much work go into it, and even policies that have been in place for more than half a century. This to him is simply bad government.

Commissioner Boicourt stated that part of the reason is that they do not understand the planning process. It is a very hidden and complex process. These are mostly new people. The question is what we as a Commission should do about it; send a respectful letter to voice these issues in front of them?

Commissioner Fischer asked for an explanation of state law as it pertains to the relationship between Planning Commissions and County Councils in the development of Comprehensive Plans. Mr. Kupersmith stated there is an Attorney General opinion and it concluded that in non-charter counties it was the Planning Commission that had the ultimate jurisdiction. Our charter states that the Planning Commission shall make a recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan. It is the mechanics that you are expressing concern about. Mr. Kupersmith is not certain whether in the Code, or state law that when the Commission turns the Comprehensive Plan over to the County Council they have to have a colloquy with the County Council. They have to have public hearings. When you have public hearings you have to have a final document. He does not know if that final document will have to be returned to the Commission for comments. They have a point that is well taken; make a recommendation and explain why things are the way they are, that is understandable. He is not sure the way to express that. There is probably a longstanding practice for the way Planning Commission members need to weigh in during the process, but certainly the members raise good points.

Commissioner Fischer stated going forward for review of this document the Council shall give the public a lengthy opportunity for review.

Mr. Kupersmith stated they will have to give the public a final version, it will not be the Commission's version with a list of attachments, it has to be a final version.

Commissioner Spies stated it seems very inefficient the way it was done. The Council may have good ideas. The Commission put a lot of thought and many hours into this. We state our ideas and they state theirs but we never have a chance to discuss it. I really feel now why did we spend sixty hours on this when I have a young family, busy operation. I know there are rules and law that say we have to do things a certain way. They should have been participating in our work sessions in the beginning. All Council members and all Commission members should have been at the table together.

Mr. Kupersmith stated the way the Charter is set up gives the level of flexibility of how the plan is adopted. Once the changes are complete could the Commission sit down with the Council.

Ms. Verdery said that would be up to the Council. But at the moment no changes have been decided. They have to decide about the changes. We have to get to the point, in public, that they have decided about what changes are going to be made.

Commissioner Spies asked if the Commission will have an opportunity on record to state that they support or do not support the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Verdery stated they absolutely would through the public hearing process.

Commissioner Fischer expressed surprise that members of the County Council appear to believe that the draft Comprehensive Plan originated in the Planning Commission. In fact, both the current 2005 Plan and the updated 2015 draft of that plan are the result of hundreds of hours of dedicated time, effort and intellect by a broad spectrum of County citizens. He stated that, as such, it represents a clear vision of our citizens for the future of this County. In a representative democracy, they have every right to expect that the Planning Commission and the County Council will respect that vision and govern accordingly. Certainly, it would be inappropriate for either body to view the Plan as a document, "to rewrite as we see fit."

Commissioner Hughes stated they will be interjecting language into the Plan which will create internal conflicts with the Plan and other County documents and they are totally oblivious to it.

Mr. Sokolich stated the Council work sessions were to be a run through of the Comprehensive Plan. They are reacting to a word or a phrase or a concept. They have not gotten to the point of making the policy changes you are worried about. The last meeting scheduled is Thursday. After that there will be 6-8 weeks before they are able to work on it again.

Commissioner Hughes read from the Charter: “The Planning and Zoning Commission shall make advisory recommendations to the County Planning Officer and the Council relating to the Comprehensive Plan, zoning maps and rules and regulations related to zoning.

Mr. Rothwell stated he came from Delaware, where they had an appointed Committee who collaboratively did it.

Commissioner Hughes wants to let public know this is not what the Planning Commission passed.

Commissioner Boicourt suggested the members write ideas down and if there is no ability for a dialogue then a letter should be prepared.

Commissioner Hughes is also concerned that when the new Council document gets put on the web for public review, the public will not know the difference. Commissioner Spies asked if there is a way the Commission can explain why the Commission made certain decisions.

Ms. Verdery stated the work sessions were supposed to be Staff explaining what the Comprehensive Plan was and an overall review of it. When it gets into the public hearings then it will be time for the Commission to respond, for the public to respond, for comments on a lot of the issues.

Mr. Kupersmith stated this process has not been scheduled or completed yet.

Commissioner Hughes stated that there is no way at a public hearing that someone can address in three minutes how many changes were made and how they are wrong.

Ms. Verdery stated if the Commission has concerns it is important to write a letter. It is important to explain the statements they have made to include: this is a review, not a full rewrite, it is a citizen document.

Commissioner Fischer asked if they did not have to make the changes in public. Ms. Verdery stated they would need to be made in public. Mr. Kupersmith stated there are two ways to make the changes. One is to go line by line and come to a consensus. The other is to give general direction to staff and say this is what we want to see. There has to be a consensus of the final project. Ms. Verdery stated anything said in the meetings were reiterated in the matrix.

Commissioner Hughes stated this needs to be discussed each month and the progress needs to be discussed each month. Commissioner Spies asked who drafts this letter and when does it go out. He felt the sooner it goes out, the better.

Commissioner Boicourt felt if the Commission blasts them at this point it will harden their opinion. At this point express our concerns and if this does not work, come back later with a blast letter.

Commissioner Fischer stated we should write a letter expressing disappointment with what has occurred and that the Commission feels they have let the County down.

Commissioner Boicourt stated one thing that could be put in the letter is a suggestion for a joint worksession with the Commission.

Commissioner Fischer will draft a mild letter to be sent out in two weeks. It will be sent around to the other Commissioners via email.

6. Staff Matters

Ms. Verdery wanted to remind everyone that we received our Community Rating System plaque from FEMA at a County Council meeting. The plaque was for being a Class 8. Commissioner Hughes stated that because this County has been diligent the citizens will get a break on their flood insurance rates.

Ms. Verdery stated that the Preliminary Coastal Flood Insurance Rate Maps are in. There will be an open house meeting in June in St. Michaels and a follow up meeting in Easton. In July or August they will come before the Planning Commissioner for recommendation to Council.

Next meeting in June Ms. Verdery potentially will not be at the Planning Commission meeting, she will possibly be at the Critical Area for a program refinement meeting.

7. WorkSessions

8. Commission Matters

9. Adjournment—Commissioner Fischer moved to adjourn and Commissioner Boicourt seconded the Motion. Commissioner Hughes adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.